

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE
March 5, 2014
Kennewick, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary	
Welcome and Introduction.....	1
State of the Site Meetings	2
RCRA Permit Modifications.....	5
100 F Area Proposed Plan.....	6
FY 2014 Committee Progress	7
HAB Member Self-Assessments	8
Committee Business.....	9
Attachments	11
Attendees	11

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Welcome and Introduction

Liz Mattson, Public Involvement Committee (PIC) chair, welcomed the committee and led a round of introductions. Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues, said that the December PIC meeting summary had been posted to the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) SharePoint site, having received a few comments from Ken Niles. The committee approved the summary.

Cathy introduced herself and PIC note taker, Melissa Thom, both of whom are returning to the Board after a hiatus. Cathy will be lead-facilitator for the Board as well, and Melissa will take notes for PIC and the Board. Cathy noted that Hillary Johnson will stay on as facilitator for the River and Plateau (RAP) and Tank Waste (TWC) committees.

Kim Ballinger, Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), introduced Mark McKenna of Mission Support Alliance (MSA), who will be working with the Board and on public involvement activities.

State of the Site Meetings

Introduction

Liz said the State of the Site (SOS) meetings had originally been scheduled for October 2013, but were rescheduled for April after the government shutdown. The original plans for the meeting have changed, so the discussion is meant to review the meeting plans, goals, and how PIC and the Board can help the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies engage the public in a new way.

Update on planning to-date

Emy Laija, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said SOS meeting materials such as the agenda, fact sheet, and save-the-date flyer are available on the Hanford website. Kim said the meetings have been advertised through a listserv notice, social media, and newspaper ads. Emy reviewed meeting dates, noting that normally meetings start in the Tri-Cities but that the SOS meetings will begin in Seattle on April 15 and end in the Tri-Cities on April 29; the Portland meeting will be held on April 16 and Hood River on April 17.

The meeting format will be an open house with hosted tables as well as a presentation and questions and answers period. Emy asked that any groups interested in hosting a table submit a request, as requests from the originally scheduled meetings were not carried over. The agencies will show the groundwater chapter of The Hanford Story video series to transition from the open house to the presentations. The DOE offices will each have ten minutes for presentations, followed by shorter presentations from the regulators. A facilitator will be hired to support the meetings. Emy reviewed the meeting agenda available online.

Kim noted the purpose of the SOS meetings is to provide perspective on what is going on with cleanup, as well as to address accomplishments and challenges.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. The committee determined that the Board should host a table at the open house and will ask for input from Board members on appropriate materials and commitments for supporting the meetings.

C. It is important for the agencies to talk about successes as well as acknowledge what is not going well. There has been a lot of news in the past few years about difficulties with the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP), so to not address an issue the public already knows about would lose credibility. DOE needs to demonstrate what they are doing to get back on track.

C. The agency leads should ask questions that encourage positive feedback, like “If you were in my shoes, how would you approach these cleanup challenges?” The purpose is to ask people to use their critical thought process and provide feedback other than just asking for their input.

R. [MSA] We would like priority questions, like for funding, answered by the public, but it is difficult for someone entirely new to Hanford to answer that from one meeting.

C. I suggest you provide a board or question area for participants to write down their questions and have a commitment for a response from the agencies. The HAB display could provide space for that kind of feedback and then we could bring it back to the agencies.

R. [DOE & EPA] Participants can have their questions answered at the meetings, and comment cards are available for other questions or comments, but we do not make a commitment to respond to written questions unless they are provided in a formal document. If someone asks a question that the agencies cannot answer, we then commit to finding the answer and responding to that person.

C. The public has the ability to influence the Hanford budget, but the budget cannot be one of the biggest concerns addressed in the presentations. Handouts can be provided to help inform the public on how to engage in the budget workshops. DOE should not make excuses for cleanup based on the budget.

C. A handout should be provided to direct the public toward informational documents to help them engage with important issues outside of the meetings. The handout can be tailored to documents or websites relating to the presentations that evening.

R. [DOE] We have handouts prepared that overview important issues. The agencies will have display boards as well. It would be more meaningful to give them handouts with all of the information rather than just web links so they walk away with all the information they need.

C. It is important to provide an experience during the open house to help the public engage and understand what sort of information they should be asking or looking for. A scavenger hunt with a prize at the end is a great tool.

C. Recent HAB advice relevant to the issues being discussed will be important to provide.

C. I suggest the agencies tailor their presentations to address issues of local significance, as what is important in Seattle might be different from what is important in Portland. In Portland, it would be important to be prepared to address the recent comments from Senator Wyden on leaking tanks.

Q. Will a local perspective be provided?

R. [EPA & DOE] Time is allotted for a five-minute local perspective after the agency presentations. Liz will speak in Seattle, Theresa Labriola will speak in Hood River, Susan Leckband and Pam Larsen will share the time in Richland, and we have reached out to Paige Knight for the Portland meeting.

C. Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), offered to provide the local perspective at the Portland meeting if no one else is interested.

Q. Has there been a shift in people who attend the Richland SOS meeting? Or is it still worker-oriented and a space for employees to air their grievances?

R. [EPA & DOE] 2011 was not too worker-oriented, but DOE also scheduled a worker-oriented meeting the week before to allow a separate space for that conversation. As the largest employer

in the Tri-Cities, I think the workforce should be encouraged to attend the SOS meetings, as well as the community.

C. I suggest DOE schedule another worker-oriented meeting to help facilitate that space this year as well. The SOS meeting dynamic is different when the workforce and decision-makers are in the same room, and sometimes the conversation gets diverted to one issue. The meetings should speak to a variety of people and issues.

C. For Seattle, in addition to basic information on what is being cleaned up and why, presentations should focus on tank and WTP issues. It is also important to show how the two offices (DOE-RL and Office of River Protections (ORP)) fit together and who does what work, as well as the roles the regulators play. It would be helpful to have a graphic to demonstrate the roles. The presentations should address long term impacts and risk in terms the public can quantify.

C. The agencies should be aware that it takes time to process new information and be able to respond accordingly.

C. Presentations should address emerging issues, like the exposure at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant and how it impacts our capabilities to move any waste offsite.

C. Presenters should be careful of the tone they use when speaking with the public. This is important work that requires a serious and professional manner. It is important not to gloss over issues and say everything is all right when the public knows it is not. The support staff also needs to be as professional and knowledgeable of the issues as the presenters, as they will also be engaging with the public.

C. Being able to rephrase someone's comment or question after they have aired it is an important communication tool to demonstrate that you have heard what they are concerned about. Letting people know that they have effectively communicated their concern helps de-escalate emotion and fosters dialogue.

R. [EPA] Sometimes acknowledging a comment in that manner appears to be a commitment to do something, so we are careful of how we respond, but we can certainly encourage better responsiveness.

C. Our public does not have enough trust with the decision-makers. They will say they have told DOE something repeatedly without response or action, so they end up not trusting the presenters and agency leads. It will be important to gain the trust of the audience by clarifying that the decision makers are in the room; the public needs to feel validated but also understand that these are informational meetings, not decision making meetings.

R. [Department of Ecology (Ecology)] Decisions are not made by one person; decisions involve many different perspectives.

Cathy reviewed key points of the discussion, noting that PIC will ask for feedback from the Board on materials and commitments of meeting support. Sharon Braswell, -MSA, requested a pre-determined person be identified to be in charge of the HAB table and materials for each meeting. Steve will announce

the dates of the meetings and required feedback during the Board meetings. The agencies will also address the meetings during their agency updates.

Emy said the agencies will not be drafting any new materials for the meetings as they are rapidly approaching, but an email address is provided online for anyone with questions about the meetings, and the public is also asked to participate in surveys at the end of the meetings. The surveys provide additional contact information for follow up if needed.

RCRA Permit Modifications

Introduction

Jean Vanni, Yakama Nation, said the purpose of the presentation is to understand the modification process for the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit, specifically for Class 2 and 3 modifications. Jean said Class 1 modifications are administrative, but modifications to Class 2 and 3 are more difficult to understand.

Regulator update

Madeleine Brown, Ecology, provided a handout on permit modifications; it is provided as Attachment 2. In addition to the handout, Madeleine emphasized:

- Notifications for Class 1 and Class 1 permit modifications are distributed quarterly through the Hanford listserv as a requirement for notifying the public.
- RAP received a more extensive presentation of what is included in class modifications; Madeleine encouraged PIC to review the presentation on the Board's SharePoint site.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. Does Ecology collect the comments from the DOE-initiated meetings?

R. [Ecology] Yes, comments should be directed to Ecology and we collect them directly for a more straight forward process. We appreciate feedback on how the process is confusing and how we might clarify.

Q. Do you use public comment to draft a response to DOE?

R. [Ecology] The first comment period allows Ecology and the public an in-depth review of the modification, and the public helps decide how we move forward. Public comment will be responded to before we release the changes to the draft permit, which will also provide a public comment period.

Q. Does a modification always become Class 3 when it is directed to Ecology?

R. [Ecology] No.

Q. Is the Class 2 public process the same as Class 3?

R. [Ecology] There are many paths we can take with Class 2. After the first comment period, we can decide the modification is ready or we can decide to hold another comment period or bump it to a Class 3. We notify the Hanford listserv when we have made a decision.

C. It would be helpful for Ecology to clarify the roles the different agencies play in this process. The fact sheet needs to clearly demonstrate how the agencies are involved and the reason for the change.

Jean asked that any comments from the committee on clarification of the process be sent to her, especially direct comments on the fact sheet, the website, and notifications distributed to the public. Ecology will confirm that the public process is as it is outlined in the handout, specifically for the differences between the Class 2 and 3 processes. Jean noted that other modifications will be brought forward soon and the Board and public need to understand them.

100 F Area Proposed Plan

Regulator update

Emy said EPA intends to release the 100 F Area Proposed Plan in the May timeframe with a 30 day comment period. The agencies expect someone to file for an extension, however, so the comment period will most likely be 60 days. Emy said public engagement activities have not been specifically outlined, but she would like to hear from the Board on specific communities to reach out to, most likely in the June timeframe. She noted the SOS meetings in April and not wanting to overwhelm the public with too many meetings.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. When will you have firm dates for the document release and public comment period?

R. [EPA] We have some flexibility with when we need to make our decision by, as EPA has shifted away from aligning with the fiscal year. It will take one to two weeks to go public once we have a finalized plan and a remedial investigation/feasibility study. 30 days notice will be provided for all public meetings. We can provide more specific dates on the April PIC conference call.

C. A webinar meeting seems more feasible for this tight timeframe.

R. [EPA] Webinars also help us reach out to individuals, not just groups.

FY 2014 Committee Progress

Check in on 6-month committee accomplishments

Cathy said committee reports during the Board meeting will focus on work plans, and Liz and Ken have requested input from the group before they present. Cathy projected the PIC Priority Topic Table and Work Plan for the group to review and make changes/additions.

Liz said she and Ken met in February to talk about PIC accomplishments in the past six months as well as plans for moving forward. Specifically, Liz and Ken noted the following as PIC accomplishments since October 2013:

- Draft advice on openness and transparency (joint with TWC)
- Draft advice on the tank waste path forward (joint with TWC)
- Discussion about tools for strategic public involvement, including unique tools and social media
- Input on SOS meetings
- Preparing for the 100 F Proposed Plan

The group updated the PIC Priority Topic Table based on accomplishments to date and emerging needs and issues, including, but not limited to:

- Addition of the discussion of permit modifications under “Input for Public Clarification”
- Changing HAB Self Assessments to HAB Member Outreach
- Addition of a category to demonstrate the non-product based input to the agencies through committee presentations and discussion.

Thoughts from committee leadership on path forward

Ken said the PIC should ask the agencies to identify where PIC can be more involved with shaping or providing input on public information materials in the future, given a deeper involvement in the past. He noted the expertise of the PIC members and ability to provide meaningful input before documents go to the public.

Fiscal Year (FY)2015 HAB Work Plan brainstorming session

Liz asked the committee to consider what the PIC should work on in FY2015. She asked members to provide input on where they think the PIC has made an impact, which approaches are the most effective, and which topics should be addressed in the future. Liz noted a few items she and Ken identified, including:

- Review and provide input on draft public information materials, including the Hanford website

- Evaluate effectiveness of TPA agency public involvement activities (not just debriefing)
- Share innovative approaches to public involvement, building on “Tool Time” and strategic public involvement topics
- Recommend public involvement activities as appropriate
- Thoroughly evaluate and discuss agency responses to advice (all committees)

In addition to the items identified by committee leadership, the group discussed:

- Fostering collaboration between the agencies, Board members, and the public around the region.
- Managing expectations for how the Board provides information to the agencies when an early opportunity for involvement arises, including discussions, advice, and sounding boards, without being locked in to a single or specific process.
- Opportunities for Board and public education while acknowledging the constraints of time and financial resources.
- Encouraging Board participation and meeting attendance; engaging the public in new ways, including site tours that could lead to additional participation and Board recruitment; forming relationships and guiding new HAB members as they integrate into the Board.

HAB Member Self-Assessments

The committee engaged in a round robin to discuss recent public involvement activities with their constituents, including:

- Steve Hudson is working with Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology, to judge a poster session for a Portland Community College (PCC) basic chemistry course.
- Liz has hosted a few happy hour sessions at the Hanford Challenge office since December, with Ken as a featured speaker for one event. Ken’s niece attended the meeting and helped create a dialogue about information for someone new to Hanford. Liz said the team played a game which limited the response time allotted for communicating complex information; each person had one minute to answer a question about Hanford. Hanford Challenge likes to plan events around Hanford public meetings in Seattle and is always looking for innovative ways to engage the public. Liz noted there will be another happy hour in March and Hanford Challenge will attend the SOS meetings, with the potential to develop a scavenger hunt activity. Liz said a few regional professors have started using the Inheriting Hanford website as a project resource for students, and the students have contacted Liz about interviewing HAB members.
- Kim said DOE continues with the Hanford Speaker’s Bureau and site tours. She is particularly excited about hosting a tour to encourage HAB participation.

- Sharon said DOE-RL and DOE-ORP briefed the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board in January and many staffers are currently attending the Waste Management Conference. Kevin Smith continues to engage with local civic clubs like the Rotary. Sharon said many visitors have visited the site recently, including representatives from Senator Patty Murray's office.
- Dieter said Ecology has spoken at six recent small group meetings. Madeleine will be participating in two more meetings this week. Dieter said he will work with Steve on the PCC event as well as engage with Shelley Cimon on opportunities in Eastern Oregon.
- Becky Holland said that in addition to her regular work on site, she recently served as an employee advocate for a DOE-Headquarters and Defense Board meeting where she provided general input on worker health and safety. Becky also spoke to her son's high school class to discuss the periodic table and how it relates to work at Hanford.

Committee Business

Confirm committee leadership nomination and selection

Cathy said the current nominations are Liz Mattson for chair and Ken Niles for vice-chair. She asked for any other nominations; none were provided. Cathy confirmed that both nominations are willing to continue in their positions.

Liz noted that her maternity leave will only affect the June in-person meeting, but that she plans to be back full time before the September meeting.

The committee confirmed their nominations for chair and vice-chair. Liz will continue her position as chair and Ken will continue as vice-chair.

Develop the committee's 3-month work plan

Cathy distributed PIC's 3 Month Work Plan and reviewed items that were developed during the February conference call. The committee made changes to the work plan, including, but not limited to:

- Following up with clarifying public information documents
- Developing waste classification frequently asked questions
- Discussion with Ecology on questions from the Air Operating Permit tour
- Adjusting the work plan based on projected timeframes for April, May, and June committee and board meetings or conference calls
- Debriefing SOS meetings

- Discussing PIC involvement in Hanford public involvement and identifying where the greatest impact has been made

Strategic Public Involvement: Tool Time Survey

Liz said she is working with Cathy to develop a survey to determine what was helpful about the Tool Time discussion held at the December PIC meeting. She noted the survey is not about the specific tools, but about the discussion on tools.

Emy noted that the time lapse between the discussion and the survey might not lend well to providing substantive input. Liz suggested including the discussion summary and PowerPoint as a reminder with the survey.

Jean asked if the survey is an appropriate place to recommend strategies and tools for when the agencies go out for public comment. Liz said it could be a response but next steps have not been determined yet. She hopes to discuss the results of the survey at the next meeting.

Upcoming conference calls / Follow up items

Liz suggested contacting committee members through text message prior to conference calls in order to encourage participation, noting that sometimes calendars are not the best way to remember meetings. She asked that anyone who would like to be notified of the meeting through text message provide her with their cell phone number.

Cathy reviewed follow-up items for the committee.

The meeting was adjourned.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Transcribed flip chart notes

Attachment 2: Ecology Permit Modifications handout

Attachment 3: PIC 3 Month Work Plan

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Rebecca Holland	Liz Mattson
Sam Dechter	Steve Hudson	Jean Vanni
	Theresa Labriola (phone)	Ken Niles (phone)

Others:

Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL	Emy Laija, EPA	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Tom Rogers, WA Department of Health	Sharon Braswell, MSA
Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues	Mark McKenna, MSA